

STACK
ANNEX

5

070

989

ZIONISM

AN APPRECIATION
AND A CRITICISM

A

0
0
0
0
4
9
6
2
7
3



BY THE

REV. J. H. ADENEY, M.A.

ZIONISM

AN APPRECIATION AND CRITICISM

DOWN the centuries year by year the cry of scattered Jewry re-echoes, 'Next year in Jerusalem!' and the Paschal prayer is reiterated, 'O rebuild the Holy City in our days and lead us thereto.' Now in the latter days the yearning for the possession of the land of their fathers and the reconstitution of their national life has inspired many in Israel to take practical steps to bring this about. The land which once was desolate has begun again to blossom as the rose under the careful cultivation of Israel's sons, and the accents of the holy tongue are again heard as the children play in the streets of Jerusalem. As one looks back over the centuries of suffering and oppression which the race has gone through, who can but sympathize with this desire for freedom and restoration, who can but admire the strength of will and faithfulness which has kept alive the fire of devotion to national ideals throughout the long centuries? What wonder that all Jewry has been stirred to its profoundest depths at the British declaration of readiness to further these aims.

History repeating itself.

That a fierce conflict has broken out within the ranks of Jewry, and that many, though prepared to aid in the establishment of a home for Jewish refugees in Palestine, are unwilling to see a Jewish state re-established is no matter for surprise to those who have read rightly the history of the first return from captivity. The motive which dictated the decree of the heathen Cyrus was a political one, but one which was overruled by God for the carrying out of His purposes. To the call of Zerubbabel and those who sympathized with him only a minority of the Jews responded. The rest remained behind,

either unwilling to leave the wealth and company of Babylon or distrusting the political character of the permission. So to-day only a minority, consisting of the oppressed and those willing to make the great sacrifice required, will be prepared to take advantage of the permission to restore the Jewish state. The majority will prefer the ease and comfort of their western homes, and will therefore be desperately afraid of the creation of a Jewish citizenship, lest they be compelled to adopt it. Some will refuse to have anything to do with it because they cannot see the hand of God in a movement which is so largely non-religious, and which has been brought about mainly through political means. It remains for the future to show whether once again God's overruling power is using this means for the fulfilment of His promise of restoration to the people of His choice.

Certainly Zionism is a living fact; Zionism seems to have come to stay and its aim seems about to be realized. That there are great difficulties in the way of its practical realization in a land in which there is a considerable Christian and Mohammedan native population, and to which the two great religions which lay claim to world-wide extension—Christianity and Mohammedanism—look in a greater or less degree as their spiritual centre, no one will dispute. Into these questions it is not the purpose of the writer to enter. Rather would he venture to call attention to a need which Zionism has considered beyond its scope.

Political Aspect of Zionism.

The officially expressed aim of Zionism as stated in the Basle Programme is given in these words: 'The object of Zionism is to establish for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law.' The complete fulfilment of this aim would reinstate the Jew in the Palestine of the days of the Kings, Judæa, Samaria, Galilee, Bashan and Gilead, with visions of eventual expansion to the limits of the promise made to Abraham, 'From the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates' (Gen. xv. 18). The *Hinterland* of these terminals would include both Egypt and Mesopotamia, with the whole Tigris and Euphrates valley, but this is not stated in the promise, and it is very doubtful if it was ever intended

to be so understood. The territory included between the two original limits would, however, allow of the gathering together of a very considerable population. Recent railway expansion in these parts of the world would place this people almost at the rail centre of the three great continents, Europe, Africa and Asia. This would put the Jew in a position to exert a wide-spreading influence upon the peoples of the Old World, from which in these days of world-wide intercourse the peoples of the New World would not be excluded. The intellectual gifts of the Jew, coupled with his progressive power, would undoubtedly lead him to make full use of this opportunity.

It becomes, therefore, of paramount importance to inquire what the Jew will stand for, what are to be the ideals of this new state. Dr Weizmann explains the task of Zionism as 'to create a home for the Jewish people in Palestine, to make it possible for large numbers of Jews to settle there and live under conditions in which they can produce a type of life corresponding to the character and ideals of the Jewish people' (*Zionism and the Jewish Future*, p. 8). In other words, the Jew will be satisfied to have a national home in which he can dwell in peace and develop his own national life, and become one of the nations of the earth. He looks upon this as the end to be lived for, instead of only the means towards the fulfilment of his destiny.

Such an answer reveals the danger in which Zionism stands of repeating the mistake so often made in Jewish history. Again and again the choice has been presented to Israel between the spiritual and the material ideal. Each time the choice has fallen upon the material ideal, and it has brought disaster in its train. It was so in the early days of the rejection of Samuel and the theocratic rule; it was so again in the later days of the rejection of the prophetic counsel to abstain from political intrigues; it was so in the final days of Jewish national life in Palestine in the choice of the political ideals embodied in Bar-cochba, rather than the spiritual ideals of Jesus Christ. Quite rightly Dr Gaster argues in the same book that 'the aim and goal of Zionism is to create for the Jew a new home, not so much for physical as for spiritual life. This must be borne in mind and never lost sight of—that the Holy Land is to become the spiritual centre of the Jews. This stands far above any political or economic consideration.' Equally true is what

the Rev. Ephraim Levine said in his sermon at the New West End Synagogue: 'As a political nation Israel never succeeded. It was not God's purpose that they should. The Bible is the best witness to this. Yes, we had warriors, we had statesmen, we had the Maccabees, we won Palestine by the sword, but politics were not our *métier*, and we did not shine as a political entity.' But this does not go far enough.

Unfortunately Zionism, in its endeavour to unite the whole nation, has felt constrained to adopt a non-religious platform. The difficulties were very real, and under existing circumstances it may have seemed the only solution, but it cannot be said to be the right one. But even in this Zionism has proved not entirely true to its principles. It admits within its ranks any Jew who will subscribe to its national aims regardless of his religious attitude. It counts among its adherents men who are outspokenly anti-religious on the one hand and those who are devoted to the most extreme forms of Rabbinical Judaism on the other, and yet it refuses to acknowledge the Jew who has accepted Christianity.

An illogical Attitude.

Dr Gaster's statement in the chapter on 'Judaism, a National Religion,' in *Zionism and the Jewish Future*, is illogical. 'No one can be a Jew who does not belong to the Jewish faith, and he who belongs to the Jewish faith belongs to the Jewish nation. A Jew who changes his faith is torn up by the roots. There is no longer any connexion between him and other Jews. He has practically died. This is the common ground on which Jews are united. There may be degrees in the strength and quality of the faith which each one acknowledges as binding on him. But we have no inquisition. As long as a Jew has not publicly renounced his faith and embraced another, he belongs to the Jewish nation. It is of extreme importance to realize that this alone constitutes a Jew—that the nationality of the Jew depends on his faith; for Judaism is a national religion' (p. 91). 'The moment a Jew has forsworn his faith he has lost everything that is Jewish. A Christian can change his faith, and yet remain a member of the nation. A Protestant Englishman can become a Roman Catholic, and still remain an Englishman; and so with every other nation. Not so with the Jews'

(p. 92). It is impossible to speak of 'degrees and quality of the faith' in one who professes atheism and attacks all religion, Judaism included. And yet such a man has no difficulty in becoming a member of the Zionist organization, and in being recognized as a Jew and one of the nation.

Far more logical is the position of H. Rosenbaum, who, in his *Juden mosaischer Konfession und christlicher Konfession* (Jassy, Roumania, 1915), asks the question: 'Does a Jew who accepts the Christian faith lose his position as a member of the Jewish nation on account of his change of faith?' and answers it by an emphatic, 'I say, No.' He urges that just as a German Protestant who becomes a German Roman Catholic remains a German, so a Mosaic Jew who becomes a Christian Jew remains a Jew. He rightly reminds his readers that Dr Herzl was not a religious Jew, and that Dr Nordau is certainly not one, and that therefore it is inconsistent of Zionism to exclude Jews because of their Christian faith. He pertinently asks why the Jewish press claims Disraeli, Heine, Marx, Herschell, Neander, and a host of other Jews who accepted the Christian faith, but are no longer alive, as Jews, if living Hebrew Christians are to be excluded from the Jewish nation. He concludes by urging Zionists either to accept Jews of the Christian faith as ordinary members or to band them together in a special branch, that this element of the nation may not be lost.

One can understand the plea that a Hebrew Christian on account of his Gentile connexion may be a cause of weakening the cohesion of the race under present circumstances. But whatever amount of truth there may be in this excuse, there can be none for excluding him from a share in the Jewish state when once it is re-established in Palestine. The Jew of the Christian faith should then be of no greater danger to the Jewish state than is the Jew of the Mosaic faith to England to-day. Indeed, he should be of less danger, for he would be in his own land and among his own people. In the first two centuries there was a recognized Hebrew Christian community in Palestine. Can any one say that it was a political danger to the Jewish state? If such freedom of conscience for the Jew as would permit of his becoming a Christian and yet remaining a member of the Jewish state is not conceded, then Zionism will show that its action is due to prejudice against Christianity. The

faith which boasts its tolerance towards all other faiths will then give a striking example of intolerance towards one faith and towards the members of its own race who embrace it.

It is surely unthinkable that in a modern state a man should be deprived of his civil rights on account of his acceptance of the faith of other lands. Could one imagine the England of to-day refusing to allow an Englishman to live in England, or depriving him of his rights because he had accepted Mohammedanism or Buddhism? Emphatically Zionism, to be logical to its own avowed principles, should accept the Jew of the Christian faith as well as the Jew of no faith, or at least announce its intention of doing so in the Jewish state for which it is working.

That the religious leaders of Jewry should object to the admission of Hebrew Christians to the Jewish state is, it is true, consistent with their general attitude towards them. It might, however, have been expected that they would show less complacency in the acceptance of avowed atheists. Their action is tantamount to an admission of a greater fear of the influence of Christianity in undermining Rabbinical Judaism than that of infidelity. In many cases it is pure prejudice, which, it is true, is the result of so many years of suffering at the hands of those who understood their Christianity amiss. In plain English it comes to this, that they would rather see a Jew an infidel than a Christian, and that surely is intolerance which is to be condemned, and which is unworthy of those who have themselves suffered so much from the intolerance of others.

The Mission of Israel.

It is this adoption of the non-religious platform which has caused Zionism to neglect to take into account the Mission of Israel. By all means let there be tolerance for all, but still let the main aim of Zionism be the possession of Palestine in order to realize the mission of the Chosen Nation. The opponents of Zionism may argue that this can be much better fulfilled by the Jews who remain in the Diaspora, but the divinely appointed centre for this work is Jerusalem and the Holy Land. 'Out of Zion shall go forth the Law' (Isa. ii. 3). Henry Moskowitz quite rightly says: 'The only right that a people has to persist in history is that right which is based upon the fulfilment of their mission. As long as they contribute to

civilization they ought to exist. If the Jews fail to make their distinctive contribution to the world, they have no right to exist. They should exist upon a qualitative basis only if Judaism prevails as a spiritual force.' And Sir Philip Magnus well puts it that 'for the Jews to revert to the position of a nation among the nations would be a step backward, a reversal of the law of historical development.'

The whole history of the Jew since the days of his great ancestor, Abraham, is one long miracle. In a very real sense Israel is the one and only chosen race on the face of the earth and through all time. This should be no cause for the boastful pride such as is too frequently voiced by the Jewish press, but for humble and thankful acknowledgment. Here is the charter of Israel's choice: 'I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great; and be thou a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed' (Gen. xii. 2-3). To this there may be added the wise words of Deuteronomy: 'For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto Himself, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye are more in number than any people: for ye were the fewest of all peoples: but because the Lord loveth you, and because He would keep the oath which He swore unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt' (Deut. vii. 6-8).

Israel was chosen to work out God's purpose in the world. Out of the one family was built up a nation, and that nation was put into a little land, uniquely fitted for the purpose of being the training school of that nation which was chosen to be the teacher of the world. It was closed in by sea and desert and yet in contact with the two greatest world powers of the day, Egypt and Assyria. It was provided with a law and given by the hand of priest and prophet an ever-deepening revelation of the character and purposes of the Creator of all things. Its whole history is one long story of learning and relearning lessons which it found hard to grasp. Only after long chastisement, amounting almost to total destruction, did it finally learn the

central lesson : 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord.' Gradually it was being taught that the truths committed to its charge were truths of world-wide import and that it was destined to be God's servant as the world's teacher. 'Ye are my witnesses' is the thrice-repeated message of the greatest of Israel's prophetic books. Twice over the ideal is put before the people, in the words of Micah, and in the words which are adopted by Isaiah as the text of his message : 'And it shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills ; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob ; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths : for out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And He shall judge between the nations, and shall reprove many peoples : and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks : nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more' (Isa. ii. 2-4).

There is the grand ideal set before Israel's sons, to be the servant of God, ministering to the world the highest truths of revelation, leading man on to the reign of universal peace. The root of it is the very negation of selfishness and self-seeking. The subsequent history of Israel has been a continuous resistance of this ideal. The story of the Book of Jonah has been repeated again and again, and for the present Israel still refuses to take the prayer of repentance on its lips. What a contrast between this glorious ideal of world service in the deepest things of man's nature and the mere desire for a refuge from suffering and the enjoyment of the good things of the earth ! How far below this wondrous vision falls the National Anthem of Zionism, 'Hatikvah'—a material hope without one word of God or high ideal.

A Vision of Zionist Culture.

Some may, however, say that the ideal of Zionists is higher than that, that they desire to present to the world a picture of what men should be, of what a state can be, and thereby to be witnesses to higher truths. Dr Weizmann very finely says :

'History justifies the faith of every conscious Jew that the striving of his people after self-expression will be fraught with advantage to humanity in its progress towards higher and higher reaches of culture and civilization. The Jewish nation has stood from time immemorial for the loftiest of spiritual ideals; its life through two thousand years of exile has been one long tribute to the supremacy of the things of the spirit; the record of the Zionist movement itself is proof of the power of an ideal to stir the Jewish people to-day to new life and heroic effort.' But through it all the selfish rather than the selfless ideal rings out. Rather may it be said that in spite of himself the Jew has been of advantage to humanity. In the persons of those whom he cast out the blessing has been received and imparted to the world. True are the yearning words of Jesus Christ: 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee! How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate' (Matt. xxiii. 37, 38). It was Jesus Christ and His Apostles who, driven out by the Jew, brought the revelation of God to a Gentile world; it was they who have proved the true witnesses of God to the nations which knew not Him. It was they who suffered martyrdom at the hand of Jew and Gentile alike, that the Gentiles might be sharers in the spiritual riches which they had received.

This is the true ideal of witnessing. A dumb and silent witness is not what the world needs. That develops all too easily into the type of spirit which says, 'Behold me, how righteous I am,' and leads to contempt for those who are less highly favoured. It is this contempt for the Gentile, outspoken or veiled, conscious or unconscious, which is at the root of the refusal to be more than a silent witness. It is easy to say, 'We are a missionary people, appointed to lead mankind to the light of the true faith, to become "God's salvation to the end of the earth."' But while it is Israel's destiny to convert mankind to the truth, that conversion was never intended to be carried out by dint of aggressive and warlike measures, by acts of coercion and persecution. Israel's duty has never been to *obtrude* his Torah upon other races, to go out into highways and byways and preach his faith to every creature.'

But such an attitude is wholly devoid of that self-sacrificing love which wins a world. It is the negation of the character of God, the All-Father Who loves all His creatures. And, sad to say, it has been the attitude of the Jewish race ever since they rejected Jesus Christ. The Elder Brother Israel has ever refused to rejoice over and take part in the welcoming home of the Younger Brother, the Gentile. Israel's ideal since then has been that of master of the world and never the servant of mankind.

Theory and Practice.

However, in so far as it goes, this newly awakened sense of the mission of Israel is a true sentiment, and one fully based on the teaching of Israel's prophets. It is indeed to be welcomed, being, as it is, largely due to Christian influence, to the spectacle of Christian missions to the heathen and to the Christian conception of a world-wide faith. Mr Claude Montefiore beautifully says in reference to the passage from Isaiah quoted above: 'Such is the exalted hope, ethical and religious in one, world-wide in its range, spiritual in its goal, which the highest teachers of the Bible explicitly connect and co-ordinate with the mission and the destiny of Israel. . . . They form, to my thinking, the essence of Judaism.' With this agree the words of Mr Morris Joseph: 'The greatness of a nation depends, not upon its size, nor upon the extent of its territory, nor upon its martial prowess . . . but upon the quality of its soul, upon the vividness and the strength and the loftiness of its ideals. . . . Next in importance to the belief in the Divine unity, and logically flowing out of it, there is the conviction that the Jewish people has been appointed to spread among men the most exalted conceptions of religious faith and duty' (*Zionism: Problems and Views*, p. 151).

But so far it seems to confine itself to destructive rather than to constructive work. It seems mainly interested in endeavouring to undermine the distinctive doctrines of the Christian faith. 'But we believe that the mere silent testimony we have given to the truth for which we stand has had and is having a tremendous effect upon the world and that it is owing to this influence that the entire structure of dogmatic Christianity is weakening so perceptibly. . . . I believe that when Jews

learn to feel their feet, they will in many directions enter upon an active propaganda, and then the progress of Jewish ideas will be a thousand times more rapid.'

This view of another Jewish writer represents the destruction of that which has made Christianity the force it has been in winning a world from degradation and heathenism. When it comes to endeavouring to win heathen races to the pure knowledge of God then there is a surprising lack of interest. True to fact is what Dr Friedenwald says: 'The theological ideal of a mission for disseminating monotheism . . . may have served eloquent preachers, but it has never and nowhere been accepted by Jews with fervent faith, nor has the non-Jewish world ever regarded it seriously. No Jew or group of Jews has been inspired by this idea to go to the non-Jewish world and preach in accordance with this mission' (*Zionism: Problems and Views*, p. 134). Any one who has been brought into contact with the leaders of Orthodox Jewry will have experienced the same total lack of interest in the fate of those outside the Jewish fold. The usual excuse given is that Israel has been so persecuted that they have had no opportunity for such work. Whatever element of truth there may be in the statement, what one notices is the utter lack of any such ideal either now or in the future. What Zionist longs for freedom in Palestine that he may devote himself to the winning of the world—and especially the heathen world—to God?

What is Judaism?

Some may, however, go so far as to say that once in Palestine, and free, this will come. Granting for the moment that this will be so, we may well ask, What will be the message which Israel will present to the world? That will depend on what form the religious life of Palestine is likely to assume. Will it be the infidelity of the Alliance Israelite and, one is bound to say, of a large number of Zionists? If so, this cannot be looked on as a hopeful prospect for the world, if such a message is to be proclaimed as a panacea for its woes. Or is it to be the mediæval and superstitious fanaticism of the Eastern Chassidim? Or the formalism of the Orthodox, tied and bound by the provisions of the Shulchan Aruch? Or is it to be the Unitarianism of the Reformed Synagogue, which combines a

selection of Christian ethics and of Jewish ceremonies ? Merely to mention the subject is to visualize some of the sunken rocks over which the new state will need very careful piloting if the dissensions and discords of the days preceding the fall of Jerusalem are to be avoided. For the moment, however, let us suppose that it is to be the message of Orthodox Judaism which is to be presented as the great gift in exchange for which the Christian world is to give up its distinctive truths and the heathen world to exchange its hoary beliefs.

The subjects which appeal most to the heart of man are his relation to God and reconciliation with Him, the standard of moral and spiritual life, and the power to attain to them.

In its doctrine of God Judaism has a true message in presenting the unity of the Godhead as against the gods many of the heathen, but Rabbinical Judaism departs from the truth implied in the Old Testament and more fully and faithfully reproduced in the New Testament. It offers but a bare Unitarianism, which is only half the truth. Such a presentation of the doctrine has never yet satisfied the heart of man, and by its impotence in imparting new life to man has proved its lack of Divine reality. The Unitarianism of Christian countries has never yet troubled itself much about the heathen, and when it has, it has been singularly unsuccessful, save among those who have already been influenced by Christianity, and when it has had the opportunity of breaking down what has already been built up. It is the preaching of God the Father, Whose name is Love, and Who manifested forth His love most chiefly in sending to the world the unspeakable gift of His Son, One with the Father in the Eternal Trinity, that wins the heart of man. Judaism has largely left this Old Testament ideal for the reiteration of a mathematical Unity, which remains cold to the world-wide needs of man.

What has Judaism to offer ?

It is, however, when we come to the question of sin and the reconciliation of the sinner to God that the message of modern Judaism fails completely. The heathen by his sacrifices bears unconscious testimony to the truths on which the Old Testament insists, and which modern Judaism, while acknowledging them in its prayers, rejects in its teaching and

practice. All mankind bears witness to the innate sense of sin as a part of our heritage, and the necessity of the expiation of sin through sacrifice. The Old Testament nowhere denies this, though it lifts the thought to a higher plane. It does deny the efficacy of the mere outward ceremony without reference either to the moral attitude of man or the inward meaning of the sacrifice. In this the Old Testament serves as a halfway house to the teaching which brings out the full truth of its types and shadows. Christianity teaches that the evil is an inherited disease, that what Jeremiah says is true: 'The heart is deceitful above all things and it is desperately sick' (ch. xvii. 9), and in consequence that man is in his nature banished from God and imperfect in all his doings. This deepens the sense of man's need and corresponds with universal human experience. To bring man to the acknowledgment of this position of unfitness and guilt was the purpose of the sacrificial system of old. As the Israelite laid his hand on the head of the sacrificial animal he acknowledged both his sin and the punishment due to him.

And yet the picture was incomplete, for after all it was but an animal, however perfect it might be. The Christian teaching carries this forward, and makes the worshipper in spirit lay his hands upon the head of the One perfect representation of the whole human race, and thereby both acknowledge his sin and guilt and accept the position as his, which the sufferer took for him. Christianity goes on to teach that that sufferer was Divine, and the sinner is overwhelmed by the love here evidenced, which was prepared to go so far to convince him of his sin and to satisfy the justice of a broken law, while at the same time providing for the exercise of mercy. The deliverance thus vouchsafed to him awakens in him the desire for a new life, and the same love provides him with the needed power for its attainment in the strength which the Divine Spirit imparts as the result of the Resurrection.

The message of Judaism, on the other hand, is that each man comes into the world a pure soul and has more or less spoiled that soul, and so incurred some measure of punishment. Man can be reinstated by repenting of that evil and acquiring sufficient merit by good works to outweigh the evil. Thereby Judaism goes right away from the spirit of the sacrificial teach-

ing, pride is developed and this vision of the infinite love and condescension of God to sinful man is lost sight of. Most aptly is the difference of attitude illustrated in the parable of the two men who went up into the temple to pray. The prayer of the one breathes the spirit engendered by such teaching, 'God, I thank thee that I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this tax-gatherer. I fast twice in the week; I give tithes of all that I get.' The prayer of the other is the true spirit of utter dependence on the mercy of God, 'God, be merciful to me, the sinner' (Luke xviii. 9-14).

By preaching repentance and good works as the means of reconciliation with God Judaism has little more to give the Mohammedan and heathen world than it already has in abundance, and from Christianity it would take away that which is its grand motive force of humility and love, and consequent self-sacrificing service to the world. Such a message will never appeal to the world. Stripped of its borrowed Christian elements, it fails to appeal even to its own people, for Jewry is fast becoming ever more sceptical as it grows more educated. And in its highest devotion it falls short of the world-embracing love which constrains the Christian missionary to renounce home and prospects and lay down his life for the heathen world. Where in Jewry would you find a man of the highest university attainments, of money and position, prepared to leave all to devote himself to the raising of, say, the cannibals of the South Seas, or the degraded tribes of Africa, or, at the other end of the scale, the destiny-bound followers of the False Prophet, or the pantheistic Buddhist? It is only when the love of Christ Jesus has taken possession of their hearts that Jews have been prepared to sacrifice life and wealth and health to carry the message to a dying world, as Gerson did in India, Hellmuth in Canada, and Schereschewsky in China.

What standard, too, of morality will the Jewish message present to the world? And here let it be remembered that it is to be that of a Judaism which will be less and less influenced by the Christian standard, for it is to be developed in Palestine where the Jews are to concentrate their attention on their own national characteristics and ideals. Is it to be the standard of the Old Testament, which, though a real message to heathenism, still falls far short of the perfect standard of the

New Testament? With the Old Testament only as its sacred book, and the standard of Eastern Jews based upon it, how will Orthodox Judaism condemn the slavery, for which the Law of Moses legislates, or the polygamy which it sanctions, and which is still practised by Jews in the East, or how will it raise the level of women, when it religiously condemns them to a secondary position? Does it not by its developments and borrowings itself tacitly acknowledge that the highest standard and the true development of Old Testament teaching is, after all, in the New Testament? In what single instance has it anything better to offer?

The true Goal of Zionism.

On an impartial examination, Judaism fails to show that it has a message which can meet the needs of the world, and has abundantly demonstrated that it has not the self-sacrificing love which would risk all to carry that message to a suffering humanity. The truth of the matter is that Judaism is a national, and not a universal, religion, and never was intended to be otherwise till the coming of the Messiah should free it from the bonds of the schoolroom to take its place as the teacher of mankind. Thus the advent of Jesus Christ as the Messiah has made Christianity the inheritor of the mission of Israel and has given it the dynamic force of a world-wide constraining love. Yet the day will still come when Israel, having accepted Jesus Christ, shall take its place in the forefront of the messengers of peace and love to the world.

Before Zionism lie two ideals. On the one hand there is the purely selfish one of a mere restoration of the Jews to their own land, and the building up of their own national existence. This is fraught with peril, for, apart from the question of internal strife between the different social, political and religious ideals (a difficulty, be it said, in Jewry far more accentuated than in other nations), there is the great danger of being drawn through the necessity for expansion and the desire for mastery into the vortex of contending nations as one of the nations of the world.

On the other hand, there is the spiritual and unselfish ideal of becoming the servant of God and witnessing to mankind in a spirit of love and self-sacrifice, thus bringing to man the glorious message of God's infinite love in the redemption of

the world through Jesus Christ, and of the power of a new life through His Resurrection. As of old the choice is between life and death : ' I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse : therefore choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed ; to love the Lord thy God, to obey His voice and to cleave unto Him : for He is thy life and the length of thy days : that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob to give them ' (Deut. xxx. 19, 20). ' I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly. I am the good shepherd ; the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep ' (John x. 10, 11).

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 049 627 3

PRINTED BY
TURNBULL & SPEARS
THISTLE STREET
EDINBURGH